REMARKS

Claims 10, 11, 23, 24, 36, and 37 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 14, and 27 have been amended. Claims 1 – 9, 12 – 22, 25 – 35, and 38 - 39 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 – 3, 8 – 16, 21 – 29, and 34 – 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Albert et al. (U.S. 6,650,641) ("Albert"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants' exemplary independent claim 1 sets forth:

"A method for performing a plurality of filter operations on a data packet using an
instruction, comprising:
        receiving an instruction to filter at least one data packet, the at least one
data packet comprising a plurality of data fields;
        retrieving a filter result based on the received instruction; and
        performing at least two of a plurality of filter operations on at least one
data field in the data packet in accordance with the retrieved filter result."

The Applicants' invention enables the capability of performing a plurality of filter operations on a data packet in accordance with a retrieved filter result. At least two filter operations can be performed on a data field in a packet in accordance with a single instruction.

Albert, in contrast, operates in a conventional manner wherein one filter operation is performed on a data field in a packet. The Applicants note that the "fixed affinities" of Albert are sometimes used by forwarding agents to modify fields in a packet. But only one modification per field is made. For instance, "the NAT action segment in the fixed affinity includes a source IP

Serial No. 09/741856   - 8 -   Art Unit: 2666

address, a source port, a destination IP address and a destination port that the forwarding agent

uses to replace the packet source IP address, the packet source port, the packet destination IP

address, and the packet destination port." (Albert Col. 28 lines 34-39.) So a single action is

performed on each of these data fields. Nowhere does Albert teach or suggest the performance of

"at least two of a plurality of filter operations on at least one data field in the data packet in

accordance with the retrieved filter result" as the Applicants have claimed. The Applicants

therefore respectfully assert that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 – 3, 8 – 9 and 12 – 13 are in

condition for allowance. Independent claims 14 and 27 contain limitations similar to those of

claim 1. The Applicants therefore respectfully assert that claim 14 and its dependent claims 15 –

16, 21 – 22 and 25 – 26, and claim 27 and its dependent claims 28 – 29, 34 – 35, and 38 – 39 are

in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 4 – 7, 17 – 20, and 30 – 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Albert. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The dependent claims 4 – 7, 17

– 20, and 30 – 33 are in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependencies upon the

independent claims 1, 14, and 27, allowable for the reasons explained above.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance.

However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully

requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 so

that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Serial No. 09/741856   - 9 -   Art Unit: 2666

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now

considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

___11/1/05___   _Mary Steubing_
Date   Mary Steubing, Reg. No. 37,946
                                           Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
                                           Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP
                                           125 Nagog Park
                                           Acton, MA 01720
                                           (978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-098